

List of Questions and Comments Raised by DRB Members at June 7, 2016 DRB Meeting Together with Summary Responses by Project Proponent

At the June 7, 2016 joint meeting of the BCDC Design Review Board and Engineering Criteria Review Board, members of the DRB raised a number of questions and comments regarding the Latitude Project. Although the applicant was able to address many of these DRB inquiries and observations at the June 7, 2016 meeting, we would like to take this opportunity to respond to those points (as referenced in the meeting minutes) that were not adequately addressed when originally raised by DRB members.

- 1) *Member McCann: “asked if the project applicant studied reducing the footprint of the wharf.”*

The option of reducing the area of the wharf that would be preserved and converted to public park use was not pursued for the following three principal reasons:

- a. The Terminal One wharf is seen by the Project Applicant and the City of Richmond as an opportunity to repurpose a 100-year-old industrial port facility for use as a publicly accessible shoreline amenity - bringing this tired structure back to life, investing it with a new public purpose, and transforming it into the centerpiece of a new Waterfront Park that will complement the diversity of open space experiences and recreational opportunities already afforded by the adjacent Miller-Knox Regional Shoreline Park. This sense of transformative potential has led to the view that a reduction in the area of the wharf would, in effect, result in a reduction in the level of public access to the shoreline that the revitalized wharf would provide and a missed opportunity to capture the full potential of this existing facility repurposed as a park amenity and public space.
- b. While the work of repurposing the wharf for public use can be accomplished with little, if any, impact to the Bay, the removal of a portion of the wharf, even if the supporting piles were left in place, would potentially have resulted in significant impacts to the Bay environment.
- c. The structural analysis that has been performed on the wharf indicates (i) that the entire wharf structure can be made safe for public use if the new concrete overlay that will be employed to repurpose the wharf deck for use as a public park is tied back to new piles that will be installed along the wharf’s northern landside edge; and (ii) that structural deficiencies are not present that would warrant removal of any portion of the wharf.

- 2) *Vice Chair Strang: “suggested that the character of the proposed street might be considered in a more casual way to blend the development with the waterfront park.”*

The landscaping along Shoreline Drive has been designed to provide a subtle and understated transition from the residential development to the north to the waterfront park to the south. It will feature a casual blend of native coastal plantings with informal tree alignments arranged to minimize impacts on views. The more formal landscaping along the southern edge of the two podium garages is designed to hide the single story exterior walls of the parking structures behind a planted slope which gives each podium the appearance of a terraced land form out of which emerge the single-family residences that front on Shoreline Drive. As the private land uses to the north of Shoreline Drive give way to the public uses that define the southern shoreline reach of the site, the more formal landscaping of the planted slope is designed to yield to the more informal landscaping treatment accorded the Waterfront Park. Because the resident and guest parking for the single family homes is provided entirely within the podium garages and because the waterfront reach of Shoreline Drive does not include on-street parking spaces in order to minimize view impacts and create a more natural aesthetic, the Shoreline Drive streetscape is distinguished by the absence of private driveways, garage doors, and parked cars, by its apparent commitment to public open space and public access, and by the casual transition it provides between the private and public uses.

- 3) *Vice Chair Strang: “Cautioned the applicant that the weight of the soils [of the landscape treatment proposed for the Terminal One Wharf] might be a concern given potential seismic hazards.”*

The structural analysis that has been performed on the wharf since the June 2016 DRB/ECRB presentation has led to changes in the landscape program designed to reduce the weight of the park improvements. SGH, the Project’s structural engineer, has designed a retrofit strategy which will significantly increase the load bearing capacity of the wharf. CMG, the Project’s landscape architect, has in turn worked closely with SGH to revise the landscape program to assure that the inertial loads imposed on the wharf are well within the load bearing capacity of the retrofitted structure.

- 4) *Chair Aschuler: “asked the project applicant to provide graphics and visuals related to the size and scale of the buildings, particularly as they relate to visual impacts from nearby parks.”*

The DRB presentation materials, prepared by the Project’s landscape architect CMG and distributed to the Board in advance of its August 7, 2017 meeting (the “CMG Presentation Materials”), include two photo-simulations which show the visual impact of the project when compared to the existing condition of the site from two viewpoints, both of which are located in the Miller-Knox Regional Shoreline Park. (See CMG Presentation Materials at

page 6.) The first photo-simulation shows the way in which the Project would impact views looking directly east from the southern terminus of the Miller-Knox Park at Ferry Point. The second photo-simulation examines the impact of the Project on views looking south across the Bay from the Miller-Knox Park ridgeline located directly north of the Project site. See also Response to Comment No. 12 below.

It should be noted that at the time these photo-simulations were prepared, the improvement plans for the wharf contemplated extensive reuse of steel trusses from the Terminal One warehouse to frame three large canopy structures that were to be located at the eastern and western ends and in the center of the wharf. Current plans call for a more limited use of the warehouse trusses to frame a single smaller family picnic pavilion at the west end of the wharf. In addition, the photo-simulations show Condominium Building No. 4 as a five-story building constructed over a single-story podium. Under current plans, however, the fifth floor of Building No. 4 has been eliminated and the building reduced to four stories over podium. These changes in the design of the Latitude Project will have the effect of reducing the visual impacts as shown in the DEIR simulations.

- 5) *Chair Aschuler: “expressed concerns that the Bay Trail was being placed away from the shoreline.”*

See Response to Comment No. 15.

- 6) *Chair Aschuler: expressed that the Design Review Board would be interested in hearing more about resilience to sea level rise?*

The Project team has performed an extensive analysis of the resiliency of the Latitude Project with respect to the potential flood risks associated with a 100-year storm event and projected sea level rise. This analysis included consideration of potential inundation resulting from wave run-up. The analysis is summarized in the following three documents which are appended to this List of Comments and Responses as Attachments #1, #2, and #3:

- Attachment #1 – BKF Memorandum Re: “Evaluation of Terminal One Base Flood Elevation and Area of Inundation,” dated January 1, 2015 (which examines the flood risk associated with a Base Flood Elevation (“BFE”) of 11 feet and a mid-century rise in sea level of up to 16 inches);
- Attachment #2 – BKF Memorandum Re: “Terminal One – Project Design Features and Adaptive Measures to Mitigate Flood Risk Associated with 100-Year Storm Events and Sea Level Rise,” dated July 24, 2017 (which examines the design features and adaptive measures employed by the Latitude Project to mitigate flood impacts associated with a BFE of 11 feet and sea level rise of 3 feet and above); and
- Attachment #3 – Simpson Gumphertz & Heger (“SGH”) Report entitled “Condition Assessment and Design Criteria for Structural Evaluation of Latitude Wharf,”

prepared for May 24, 2017 ECRB meeting (Section 4 of which describes the “Shoreline Protection Assessment performed by SGH which includes an analysis of wave run-up).

In short, the Latitude Project includes design features that will either be incorporated in the development of the Project as originally constructed or will be implemented as adaptive measures on an as-need basis to mitigate the impacts associated with the BFE of 11 feet plus up to 3 feet of sea level rise. In addition, the Project is required by the conditions of approval to develop an “Adaptive Flood Risk Management Strategy to address 100-year flood impacts associated with a rise in sea level of greater than 3 feet.” The strategy is required to include an on-going monitoring and reporting program, an analysis of potential adaptive measures, an implementation schedule, and a financing strategy.

7) Member McCann: requested clarification of available parking counts.

The Project will provide 40 on-street parking spaces for public use (consisting of 29 spaces on Shoreline Drive and 11 spaces on Brickyard Cove). The Project will also provide 601 spaces in the two podium garages for private use of residents, guests, and employees. The podium parking count exceeds the local parking standards. Because the parking in the podium garages is dedicated to private use by the residents, their guests, and the Project employees, the on-street public parking spaces will be time-limited to discourage use by these same private parties and to thereby increase the availability of the on-street public parking spaces to visitors seeking to access the new Terminal One Waterfront Park.

8) Member Hirsh: “asked what will be done if structural analysis reveals the wharf is not able to accommodate the landscaping.”

See Response to Comment No. 3 above.

9) Vice Chair Strang: “suggested that the applicant bring in graphics to show [the at grade north-south pedestrian access connection].”

The CMG Presentation Materials include additional graphic illustrations of the north/south at-grade public promenade (see, in particular, pages 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8).

10) Vice Chair Strang: “requested additional sections and graphics related to [the relation of the single family homes, Shoreline Drive, and the Bay Trail Loop].”

The CMG Presentation Materials include additional sections and graphics showing the relationship of the residential buildings to both the shoreline and the Waterfront Park

improvements including Shoreline Drive and the Terminal One Wharf (see, in particular, pages 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 17, and 18).

- 11) *Member Leader: “mentioned that the Rosie the Riveter memorial is the first in a series of historic shoreline projects developed in Richmond and suggested that the site could continue this historical story.”*

The CMG Presentation Materials include exhibits that illustrate the ways in which the design of the Latitude Project is seeking to give expression to the historic context in which it is being developed by: (a) repurposing the Terminal One Wharf for public use as the centerpiece of the Terminal One Waterfront Park and (B) through reuse of elements from the existing wharf and warehouse (such as the wharf mooring bollards; the “WHARF NO. 1” pediment signage; and the warehouse roof trusses, roof deck timbers and beams, and crane truss) and of existing site features (such as the railroad tracks that provided historic rail access to the wharf and warehouse and select examples of the “street/graffiti” art that has appeared on the site in more recent years) (see, in particular, pages 13, 22, and 23). See also Response to Comment No. 15.

- 12) *The Board would also “like to see additional graphic exhibits that highlight the potential visual impacts from surrounding areas as well as the visual character of Shoreline Drive.”*

See Response to Comment No. 4 above which describes the graphic exhibit that is included at page 6 of the CMG Presentation Materials. In addition, the Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) for the Latitude Project (prepared by the City of Richmond’s environmental consultant ESA and certified by the Richmond City Council when it approved the land use entitlements for the Project in July of last year) includes an extensive analysis of the “effects of the project on scenic vistas and scenic resources, visual quality and visual character, as well as its potential to have adverse light and glare effects” (City of Richmond Terminal One Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (the “DEIR”) dated February 2016 at page 4.1-1). The Project EIR concluded that with respect to each of these areas of aesthetic concern, the Latitude Project, as conditioned by the Project approvals, would have a less-than-significant impact. For ease of reference, Section 4.1 “Aesthetics” of the DEIR is appended in its entirety to this List of Comments and Responses as Attachment #4.

- 13) *The Board requested the presentation of “further analysis related to the elevations of proposed public access, resiliency to sea level rise, and adaptation strategies to sea level rise.”*

See Response to Comment No. 6. In addition, see CMG Presentation Materials at pages 3, 7, 8, 12, and sections at pages 17-23.

14) A representative of the Brickyard Cove Association for Responsible Development ("BCARD" expressed concerns regarding visual impacts from the Miller-Knox Regional Shoreline Park; the representative was concerned that the proposed height of the buildings is too tall and will impact views.

See Responses to Comments Nos. 4 and 12.

15) A representative from the Association of Bay Area Governments and Bay Trail explained proposed (a) that the Bay Trail should be "located as close to the shoreline as possible" and (b) that the wharf be redesigned "to allow for both bicycle and pedestrian traffic."

Response to 15(a) – The idea of revising the Terminal One site plan to move the Bay Trail closer to the shoreline was raised during the City of Richmond land use entitlement process. In response to this proposal, the site plan was revised to move the southwestern segment of the Bay Trail Loop (which in previous versions of the site plan had been located adjacent to Shoreline Drive) to a location at the edge of the Project's western shoreline. At the time, we explained that the portion of the Bay Trail Loop located to the east of the Terminal One Wharf had not been moved closer to the water because of grade constraints and because to do so would have conflicted with the waterfront rails-to-trails pathway planned for this location. Full consideration was given to the proposal to move the segment of the Bay Trail east of the wharf to a location closer to the shoreline during the public hearings on the Project entitlements in June and July of last year and the Richmond City Council, acting on the recommendation of the Planning Commission and Design Review Board, approved the Master Plan for the Project with the alignment of the Bay Trail as shown on the plans we have submitted for BCDC DRB review.

We would respectfully suggest that the City Council's actions in this regard are based on sound planning and design considerations for the following reasons. In preparing the landscape program for the waterfront east of the wharf, we sought to preserve both (a) the narrow band of original shoreline between the Bay Trail and the rip-rap slope at the water's edge and (b) the existing railroad tracks that are located within this band and that provided historic rail access to the warehouse and wharf. The landscape plans propose to convert this rail line into a publicly accessible pathway that will provide direct at grade access to the waterfront. This rails-to-trails feature is part of a design effort both to create a variety of access experiences for the public to enjoy and, at the same time, to preserve the historical context of the site – that is, to recognize and acknowledge the historical precedent of the prior port use of the site and to build this sense of the past into the present-day sense of place we are seeking to create. The continued presence of the rail line as a public amenity will serve as a visual link to this historical context and as a reminder that the waterfront park once played a very important role in the economic development of the City of Richmond.

Similarly, by aligning the Bay Trail to connect to the wharf at its mid-point, the Latitude Master Plan seeks to create a centered sense of “arrival” that is complemented by the separation between the Bay Trail and the eastern and western ends of the wharf, which in turn conveys a sense of “destination.” This separation of Bay Trail and wharf is also designed to expose the northern edge of the wharf and express the wharf’s original footprint.

As shown in the upper right hand corner of the image appearing at page 13 of the CMG Presentation Materials, as originally constructed in 1915, the Terminal One Wharf and warehouse were surrounded on three sides by the waters of the Bay. The green space between the Bay Trail and the eastern and western reaches of the wharf is, in part, also intended to express the wharf as it once was – an almost free-standing appendage of the shore rising out of the Bay. The difference in grade between the green space area that separates the two ends of the wharf from the Bay Trail also allows us to bridge the lower lying open space corridor at both ends of the wharf with elevated walkways to create more compelling arrival points and further accentuate the wharf’s defining presence as the centerpiece of the Terminal One Waterfront Park. See pages 18 and 22 of CMG’s Presentation Materials.

It is also worthy of note that, as the section exhibit shown at page 23 of the CMG Presentation Materials illustrates, if the Bay Trail is realigned to abut the shoreline to the east of the wharf, it could only be moved approximately 10-20 feet closer to the water’s edge and the relocation would require the import and placement of fill in the shoreline band.

Response to 15(b) -- Although the Terminal One Wharf is designed to be directly accessible from the Bay Trail and the Bay Trail is designed to provide direct access to the wharf, the Terminal One Wharf is not designed to accommodate bike riding. When a representative of the San Francisco Bay Trail Project requested that the Richmond City Council require that the landscape program for the wharf be redesigned to make provision for direct bicycle access on the wharf itself, we responded by pointing out that such use would conflict with, detract from, and otherwise compromise the visitor experience the wharf is designed to provide for the following reasons.

The wharf is designed to be: (i) a place where visitors are provided an opportunity both to enjoy without safety concerns the panoramic views and shoreline values afforded by the wharf’s waterfront setting and to connect with the Bay-shore environment on a personal level; (ii) a place for quiet contemplation; (iii) a haven where people can gather and converse; and (iv) a retreat where visitors can experience a safe and harmonious sense of the natural order.

It is worthy of note that the Terminal One Master Plan has been explicitly designed to make this experience available to bicyclists accessing the wharf by way of the Bay Trail. The waterfront park will include a bike node/way station with bicycle parking immediately adjacent to the wharf where bicyclists can dismount and either lock their bikes to the bike racks that will be provided, or, if they would prefer, walk their bikes onto the wharf.

If bicyclists are allowed to ride their bikes on the wharf, however, it will introduce unavoidable conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians that not only will put the safety of both at risk, but also will require a level of vigilance by those seeking to enjoy the wharf's attributes on foot that will fundamentally detract from and compromise the visitor experience the wharf is uniquely able to provide.

In this regard, we also pointed out that while SFBTP's comments reflect a focused concern with respect to the risk to bicyclists posed by automobiles, their proposal to convert the wharf into an extension of the Bay Trail reflects an absence of concern regarding the risk to pedestrians posed by bicyclists.

Put simply, the wharf is designed as a gathering place--a place to celebrate the passive public use of this important community resource to actively engage with the waterfront. For the reasons summarized above, the Richmond City Council, acting upon the recommendations of the Planning Commission and Design Review Board, approved the Latitude Master Plan as proposed without bicycle access on the wharf. Converting the wharf to an extension of the Bay Trail makes no sense for either pedestrians or for bicyclists using the Bay Trail to access the shoreline's extraordinary attributes.